NOTES FOR A REVISION OF THE ANT GENUS FORMICA. 1. NEW IDENTIFICATIONS AND SYNONYMIES FOR SOME NEARCTIC SPECIMENS FROM EMERY, FOREL AND MAYR COLLECTIONS.¹

Andre Francoeur²

ABSTRACT: Specimens of the ant genus *Formica* belonging to Emery, Forel and Mayr Collections have been examined and reidentified according to the actual taxonomic knowledge. These new identifications and synonymies influence the known geographic distribution of the species involved. The status of a number of types is precised.

DESCRIPTORS: Ants, Formica species, taxonomy, reidentification, type status, distribution.

During the course of a revision of the nearctic species belonging to *Formica fusca* group, it has been possible to examine a number of specimens mentioned by Mayr and Emery in papers published respectively in 1886 and 1893. Most of them were named under the description of new taxa. Confrontations between texts and specimens reveal that in many cases there were included under a new name series of specimens belonging to more than one taxon. Therefore new identifications and synonymies are needed to give a full account of the facts. Most of those pertaining to nearctic species of the *Formica fusca* group are already published (Francoeur, 1973). The remaining ones and those concerning other species groups are presented here. New revised identifications are also listed for nearctic specimens from the Forel Collection. Status and labelling of types are discussed for a number of species.

This kind of analysis has been almost completely neglected for the nearctic species of the genus *Formica*. Based on the examination of old collections and not just on old papers that contained most often inaccurate descriptions according to the present morphological standards in myrmecology, it will allow us to understand more precisely the nature of past authors' new taxa, to sort out misinterpretations, particularly those continuing in recent years, and to neutralise aberrant publications on the systematics and geographic distribution of ants (see Brown's comments on

ENT. NEWS, 85: 9 & 10: 257 - 264, November & December 1974

MITHSOND

SFP 25 1

LIBRAHLE

¹Accepted for publication: June 12, 1974

² Universite du Quebec, Chicoutimi, Quebec, Canada, G7H 2B1.

that matter, 1950 and 1951). This beginning paper will present among other data the results of the study of ant collections containing *Formica* specimens.

FORMICA NEOGAGATES GROUP

Neogagates complex

Formica lasioides Emery

Formica lasioides Emery, 1893, p. 664.

Formica fusca r. subpolita var. neogagates: Forel (in part), 1904, p. 153.

Emery Collection:

- under *lasioides:* 2 β with a typus label from Hill City, S. Dakota (no. 151, 21-IX-1890, T. Pergande), one β is labelled by me lectotype and the other paratype; the third specimen of the type series is in the W.M. Wheeler Collection in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University; 6 β from Boulder, Colorado (W.M. Wheeler); - under *neogagates::* 1 β from Kittery Point, Maine (VIII-1891, probably T.

Pergande).

Forel Collection:

- under *neogagates lasioides:* 1 ⁹ with a cotypus label from S. Dakota (T. Pergande); this specimen cannot be a paratype of *lasioides*, at most it is a topotype; 3 ⁹ from Colorado;

- under *neogagates lasioides vetula*: 1 % with a cotypus label from Lawrence, U.S.; this specimen cannot be a type of *vetula*; 5 % and 1 % from Colorado; 14 % from New Hampshire;

- under fusca subpolita neogagates (Forel, 1904): 2 from Vermillon Pass, Alberta (E. Whymper); the mentioned with them belongs to *F. hewitti*;

- under *neogagates:* 1 ? (Denny) and 5 ? from Connecticut; 3 ? from MacLean, Boston (A. Forel); 2 ? from Nebraska (Wilby); 3 ? (A. Forel) and 1 ? from New Hampshire; 3 ? from New Jersey (Treat); 19 ? from Toronto, Ontario (A. Forel); 2 ?from U.S.A. (G. B. King);

– under *fusca subpolita* (first labelled *F. gagates* var. americaine): 4 γ from New Hampshire (Treat); also 1 γ from North America.

Formica neogagates Emery

Formica fusca subsp. subpolita var. neogagates Emery, 1893, p. 661-663.

Emery Collection, under *neogagates*: 3 φ and 1 \Im from Beatty, Pennsylvania (no. 334, T. Pergande); this is the type locality selected by Wheeler, 1913; one φ is labelled by me lectotype, and other specimens paratypes; 4 φ from New York (Schmilken); 3 φ and 1 \eth from Salt Lake, Utah; 1 φ and 1 \Im from Louisiana; all these specimens are mentioned by Emery (1893), no ant has been seen from S. Dakota nor Maryland, but 3 φ have no locality label; also 4 φ from Rockford, Illinois (W.M. Wheeler). Forel Collection, under *neogagates*: 4 φ with cotypus labels from Beatty, Pennsyl-

Forel Collection, under *neogagates:* 4 φ with cotypus labels from Beatty, Pennsylvania (no. 334, T. Pergande), labelled by me paratypes; 2 φ from New York (C. Emery); 10 φ from Worcester (A. Forel) and 24 φ from Franklin Park, Boston (A. Forel), Massachusetts; 6 φ from Berkeley, California; 1 φ from Mt. Mitchell, N. Carolina.

Obtusopilosa complex

Formica perpilosa Wheeler

Formica fusca subsp. subpolita var.? montana Emery (in part), 1893, p. 663.

Emery Collection:

- under montana: 1 φ from West Point, Nebraska; this specimen was in the type series of montana;

– under *subpolita*: 3 φ from Globe, Arizona (no. 172, 2-VI-1884, probably T. Pergande).

Forel Collection, under *montana*: 4 9 and 1 9 from San Jacinto, California (no. 323, 14-XI-1891, T. Pergande).

Mayr Collection, under *subpolita*: 1 ρ and 1 $\hat{\varphi}$ from Nebraska (T. Pergande) and 1 $\hat{\gamma}$ from Colorado (E. Norton).

FORMICA FUSCA GROUP

Cinerea complex

Formica cinerea Mayr

Formica cinerea Mayr, 1853, p. 281-282.

This palearctic species is listed here to illustrate the messy situation of the *fusca* group in Eurasia. I have examined 21 specimens, all identified as *cinerea* in the Mayr Collection:

- 7 φ (including one type worker) and 3 δ belong to F. cinerea;
- -1 9, 1 9 and 1 d are species X of the *cinerea* complex;
- 4 pare species Y of the *cinerea* complex;
- 1 d is species Z of the *rufa* group;
- 1 q is probably *F. fusca*.

Formica canadensis Santschi

Emery Collection, under fusca subscricea: 3 9 from Breckenridge, Colorado.

Formica montana Emery

Forel Collection:

under cinerea: 3 γ from Rockford, Illinois, labelled by me topotypes of montana;
under cinerea neocinerea: 1 γ with a cotypus label from Rockford, Illinois
(25-VIII-1902, W.M. Wheeler), labelled by me paratype of neocinerea; 3 γ from Iowa
City, Iowa (nest no. 3, 15-IV-1894, II.F. Wickham);

- under cinerea rutilans: 2 9 from Illinois.

Mayr Collection. Identified to *cincrea* by G. Mayr, I have seen 6 9 from Illinois; this state was not listed in Mayr's paper of 1886.

Formica pilicornis Emery

Formica fusca var. cinerea Mayr (in part), 1886, p. 427.

Forel Collection, under *cinerea pilicornis*: 4 from San Jacinto (T. Pergande?) and 2 from San Francisco (Turner), with cotypus labels; 3 from California (illegible locality).

Mayr Collection. The specimens reported from California by Mayr (1886) under the name *cinerea* were identified as a new species by Emery (1893). I have seen 4 % from Tres Pinos (T. Pergande) and labelled them paratypes; also 1 % from Milde, mentioned in

Emery's paper (1893, p. 664). Mayr listed *cinerea* from New Mexico; according to the actually known geographic distribution of the nearctic species of the *cinerea* complex (Francoeur, 1973), there could not be specimens of *pilicornis*, but were probably *canadensis*. This point will be solved only if the specimens are ever found.

Neoclara complex

Formica neoclara Emery

Formica fusca var. neorufibarbis: Forel (in part), 1904, p. 153.

Forel Collection:

- under *fusca neoclara*: 6 % with a cotypus label from (no locality) Colorado (no. 165, T. Pergande), labelled by me paratypes; 3 % with cotypus labels and 2 % from Canon City, Colorado (P.J. Schmitt);

- under *fusca neorufibarbis:* 1 9 from Field, British Columbia (VIII-IX-1901, E. Whymper); 3 9 and 1 9 from Rockies, U.S.A. (G. Rothney).

Formica occulta Francoeur

Forel Collection, under *fusca subaenescens:* 7 9 from Lakin, Kansas (1887, S.H. Scudder).

Subpolita complex

Formica subpolita Mayr

Formica fusca var. subpolita Mayr (in part), 1886, p. 426-427.

Forel Collection, under *subpolita*: 2 9 with a cotypus label from San Francisco, California (L.W. Schaufuss), labelled by me paratypes; 1 \circ with cotypus label from San Gregorio, California.

Mayr Collection. I have received and examined 25 workers and 4 females which were actually classified under the name *Formica gagates* ssp. *subpolita:*

- 14 φ and 2 $\hat{\varphi}$ from San Francisco, California (L.W. Schaufuss). Since Wheeler (1913) selected this city as the type locality, only these specimens were considered to constitute the type series. One worker was labelled lectotype and the others paratypes;
- 1 γ from Sacramento, California (L.W. Schaufuss) and 1 γ from Connecticut (E. Norton) are also *F. subpolita*. The locality label of the last worker is erroneous without doubt, for this species is restricted to the Pacific side of North America (Francoeur, 1973);
- All the remaining specimens are not *subpolita*; they represent *F. neogagates, F. perpilosa* and *F. fusca (marcida* form).

Why did Mayr gather all these specimens under his *subpolita*? Because they all share the three main characters used by him to establish his new variety: shining tegument, dilute pubescence and long flexuous erect hairs on the dorsum of body. In the case of F, *fusca (marcida* form), only the female shows such features. It is noteworthy that those characters are also found in F. *gagates* Latreille. This situation explains why some authors have associated *subpolita* with Latreille's species. After the description Mayr (1886) cited the geographic origin "aus Connecticut, Colorado und Californien". The first two states are wrongly cited according to the material examined.

Lepida complex

Formica aerata Francoeur

Forel Collection, under *cincrea neocinerea*: $3 \ \varphi$ with a cotypus label from San Jose, California (H. Heath); these specimens are not types of *neocinerea*.

Subsericea complex

Formica argentea Wheeler

Forel Collection:

- under *fusca subsericea argentata*: 5 with a cotypus label from Rockford, Illinois, labelled by me paratypes; 26 from Nebraska (Wilby), first named *F. fusca*;

- under fusca subsericea: 1 9 and 1 & from Virginia (4-VII-1880, T. Pergande);

- under fusca subaenescens: 1 9 from Lake Tahoe, Nevada.

Formica glacialis Wheeler

Formica fusca 1. subsericea: Forel (in part), 1899.

Formica subsericea: Forel (in part), 1900.

Emery Collection, under *fusca subsericea subaenescens:* 1 9 from Utica, New York (no. 147, probably T. Pergande).

Forel Collection:

– under *fusca subsericea:* 6 γ from U.S.A. (G.B. King); 1 γ from Toronto, Ontario (A. Forel);

- under fusca subaenescens: 51 , and 1 and 21 from Niagara, 2 from High Park, Toronto, and 2 from illegible locality, Ontario (A. Forel); 3 from Ottawa, Ontario (F. Santschi).

Formica podzolica Francoeur

Formica fusca var. subaenescens: Forel, 1902, p. 699.

Forel Collection:

- under fusca subsericea: 2 γ from Ilill City, S. Dakota (VI-1890, T. Pergande);

– under fusca subaenescens: 6 % from Ottawa, Ontario (F. Santschi); 1 % from Mount Goodsir, British Columbia.

Formica subsericea Say

Formica fusca r. subsericea: Forel (in part), 1899. Formica subsericea: Forel (in part), 1900.

Emery Collection:

- under *fusca subsericea argentea*: 3 β and 3 φ from New York (Schmidt); 2 β from Woodbridge, Connecticut (28-VI-1891); 1 φ without locality label;

- under fusca subsericea: $3 \ \beta$ and $2 \ d$ from Virginia (no. 10, 23-VII-1882, T. Pergande); $1 \ \beta$ without locality label;

– under fusca subsericea subaenescens: 1 γ from New Haven, Connecticut (1-V1-1897).

Forel Collection:

- under *fusca:* 2 γ from New Jersey (Treat); 3 γ from Baltimore, Maryland (Ris); 2 γ from New York (Holl);

- under *fusca subsericea*: 10 from Cromwell, Connecticut (A. Forel); 3 and 1 d from Washington, D.C. (A. Forel); 1 from Kansas City, Kansas; 30 from Baltimore,

ENTOMOLOGICAL NEWS

Maryland; 11 9, 8 9 and 2 8 from Franklin Park, Boston; 20 9 from Worcester and 1 9 without locality label, Massachusetts (A. Forel); 2 9 from Ann Arbor, Michigan; 6 9 from illegible locality and 1 § from White Mountains Valleys (S.H. Scudder), New Hampshire; 1 9 from New York; 5 9 from Mount Mitchell (A. Forel) and 34 9 from N. Carolina; 3 9 from High Park, Toronto, Ontario (A. Forel); 2 9 from U.S.A. (G.B. King); 3 9 from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; 1 9 without locality (10-VII-1881, T. Pergande), Virginia; 11 9 from Morganton, N. Carolina (A. Forel); 4 9 with illegible labels;

- under fusca subaenescens: 1 9 from Worcester, Massachusetts; 3 9 from Morganton, N. Carolina (A. Forel); 2 9 from Niagara, Ontario (A. Forel).

Fusca complex

Formica accreta Francoeur

Forel Collection, under fusca subsericea subaenescens: 1 9 from Yale, British Columbia (Dieck).

Formica fusca Linne

Formica fusca: Francocur, 1973, p. 189-201.

Specimens classified in the marcida form:

Emery Collection, under fusca subsericea subaenescens: 4 9 from Yale, British Columbia.

Forel Collection, under fusca subaenescens: 1 o from California.

Mayr Collection, under gagates subpolita: 1 9 from California (Luckett).

Specimens classified in the subaenescens form:

Emery Collection, under fusca subsericea subaenescens: 4 9 from New Jersey. Forel Collection:

 under fusca subsericea: 2 ç from Virginia (T. Pergande);
under fusca subaenescens: 1 ç from Hill City, S. Dakota (VII-1890, T. Pergande), labelled by me paratype; 7 9 with a cotypus label from Colebrooke, Connecticut; these are not types; 24 o from Toronto, Ontario (A. Forel); 4 o from Ann Arbor, Michigan (no. 14, Gaige).

Neorufibarbis complex

Formica hewitti Wheeler

Formica fusca r. subpolita var. neogagates: Forel (in part), 1904, p. 153.

Formica fusca var. subaenescens: Forel, 1904, p. 153.

Forel Collection:

under neogagates: 1 9 from Vermillon Pass, Alberta (E. Whymper);

- under fusca subaenescens: 13 q from Vermillon Pass, British Columbia (E. Whymper).

Formica neorufibarbis Emery

Formica fusca var. neorufibarbis: Forel, 1902, p. 699; Forel (in part), 1904, p. 153.

Emery Collection:

under fusca subsericea neorufibarbis: 3 9 from Ouray (VIII-1891, T. Pergande), 4 9 from Breckenridge (no. 273), 2 9 from Ward (W.M. Wheeler), 8 9 from Argentine Pass, t o from Georgetown and 1 o from Meadow Peak, Colorado (A.C. Burrill).

262

Forel Collection:

- under neogagates: 5 ç from Argentine Pass, Colorado (S.H. Scudder), first named fusco-rufibarbis:

- under lasioides vetula: 1 9 from Hill City, S. Dakota (no. 151, T. Pergande), labelled by me topotype;

- under fusca gelida: 2 γ and 1 γ from Cripple Creek and 6 γ from Georgetown (1877, S.H. Scudder), Colorado, with cotypus labels; they are not types of gelida; 13 o from Argentine Pass, Colorado;

– under fusca neonifibarbis: 6 \circ with cotypus label from Hill City, S. Dakota (8-VII-1890, T. Pergande), labelled by me paratypes; 1 \circ from Vermillon Pass and 2 \circ from Vermillon Valley, Alberta (E. Whymper); 2 \circ from Field (VIII-IX-1901, E. Whymper), 1 9 from Emerald Summit Lake (VII-1901, E. Whymper), 1 9 from Yoho Valley, 3 o from Ice River Valley, British Columbia; 2 o from Argentine Pass, Colorado (1877, S.H. Scudder);

- under subpolita: 1 9 from Ossipee (?), New Hampshire (1877, Denny).

Rufibarbis complex

Formica gnava Buckley

Emery Collection, under fusca subsericea neorufibarbis: 7 o from Canon City, Colorado (W.M. Wheeler); 8 o from Austin, Texas (W.M. Wheeler), labelled by me neoparatypes.

Forel Collection, under *rufibarbis gnava*: 10 c and 3 9 from Austin, Texas (W.M. Wheeler), labelled by me neoparatypes; 3 c from San Angelo, Texas.

Subcyanea complex

Formica subcvanea Wheeler

Formica fusca var. subsericea: Forel, 1899, p. 128; Wheeler, 1913, p. 565.

Forel Collection:

under fusca subsericea: 1 φ from Moyoapam, Mexico;
under fusca subaenescens: 1 φ from Moyoapam, Mexico;

- under subcyanea: 3 o with a cotypus label from Guerrero Mill, Mexico, labelled by me paratypes.

Occidua complex

Formica occidua Wheeler

Forel Collection:

- under moki: 3 q with a cotypus label from Arizona, labelled by me paratypes of moki:

- under nufibarbis occidua: 7 9 from Oakland, 4 9 with a cotypus label from San Jose (H. Heath) and 6 o from Berkeley, California.

FORMICA RUFA GROUP

Formica dakotensis Emery

Emery Collection: 3 q with typus label from Hill City, S. Dakota; I q is labelled by me lectotype and the others paratypes.

MISCELLANEOUS GENERA

Camponotus noveboracensis (Fitch)

Forel Collection, under F. subaenescens: 1 9 from Toronto, Ontario.

Camponotus pennsylvanicus (DeGeer)

Forel Collection, under *F. fusca subsericea*: 4 from Kansas City, Kansas and 1 from Morganton, N. Carolina (A. Forel).

Lasius pallitarsis (Provancher)

Forel Collection, under F. fusca neorufibarbis: 1 from Yoho Valley, British Columbia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the following individuals for providing facilities in the museum or for loan of specimens: Dr. Claude Besuchet, Musee d'Histoire Naturelle, Geneve, Switzerland (Forel Collection), Dr. Enrico Tortonenese and Dr. D. Guiglia, Museo Civico di Storia Naturale, Genoa, Italy (Emery Collection) and Dr. Max Fischer, Naturhistorisches Museum, Wien, Austria (Mayr Collection).

Thanks are due to Dr. W.L. Brown of Cornell University for criticizing and revising the manuscript. This study has been supported by a research grant (A6501) of the National Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES CITED

- Brown, W.L. 1950. Morphological, taxonomic, and other notes on ants. Wasmann Jour. Biol. 8(2): 241-250.
- Brown, W.L. 1951. On the publication date of *Polyhomoa itoi* Azuma (Hymenoptera, Formicidae). Mushi 22: 93-95.
- Emery, C. 1893. Beitrage zur Kenntniss der nordamerikanischen Ameisenfauna. Zool. Jahrb. Syst. 7: 633-682.
- Forel, A. 1899. Excursion myrmecologique dans l'Amerique du Nord. Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. 43: 438-447.
- Forel, A. 1899. Hymenoptera. III. Formicidae. Biologia Centrali-Americana, 160 p.
- Forel, A. 1900. Ueber nordamerikanische Ameisen. Verh. Ges. Deutsch. Nat. Aerzte Munchen 2(1): 239-241.
- Forel, A. 1902. Descriptions of some ants from the Rocky Mountains of Canada (Alberta and British Columbia), collected by Edward Whymper. Trans. Ent. Soc. London: 699-700.
- Forel, A. 1904. Fourmis de British Columbia recoltees par M. Ed. Whymper. Une nouvelle *Carebara*. Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg, 48: 152-155.
- Francoeur, A. 1973. Revision taxonomique des especes nearctiques du groupe fusca, genre Formica (Formicidae, Hymenoptera). Memoire Soc. Ent. Quebec, no. 3, 316 p.
- Mayr, G.L. 1853. Beschreibungen einiger neuer Ameisen. Verhandl. Zool. -bot. Ver. 3: 277-286.
- Mayr, G.L. 1886. Die Formiciden der Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-amerika. Verh. Zool. -bot. Ges.Wien 36: 419-464.
- Wheeler, W.M. 1913. A revision of the ants of the genus Formica (Linne) Mayr. Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harvard 53(10): 379-565.